



LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT PLANNING STAFF REPORT



HEARING DATE: October 5, 2006

AGENDA ITEM NO: 5

Project Description

Applicant: Land Use Services Department
Proposal: General Plan Update project to include: an update of the County General Plan goals, policies and maps (including associated land use district changes); the establishment of 13 community plans; and a complete revision to Title 8 of the San Bernardino County Code (the Development Code).
Index: CW1-849N
CATS: 00243CQ0
Community: Countywide
Location: Countywide
Staff: Randy Scott

Background

Preparation of Community Plans

A key component of the General Plan Update project is the preparation of 13 community plans. These community plans identify goals and policies which are unique or important to each particular community. When the 1989 General Plan and Development Code were adopted, the community plans which were in effect at that time were simultaneously repealed. Any unique development standards which were identified within the repealed community plans were incorporated into the 1989 Development Code.

The Phase I Scoping of the 2006 General Plan update recommended that the Community Plan program be reinstated to help fulfill the need for development guidance within these 13 communities. Community plans focus on a particular region or community within the overall County General Plan.

To aid County staff and our General Plan update consultants in the re-establishment of community plans, Advisory Committees were established within each Community Plan area. These committees provided invaluable assistance in formulating the community goals and policies and facilitating public input into each plan. Throughout the entire community plan process, 53 different meetings were conducted in preparation of the 13 draft community plans.

As an integral part of the overall Plan, community plans must be consistent with the General Plan. Community plans build upon the goals and policies of each element of the General Plan. Regional policies have been developed within the General Plan, which address policies that are common to each of the three geographic regions (Valley, Mountain and Desert) of the County. Community plan goals have been customized to meet the specific needs or unique circumstances or wishes of individual communities. The goals and policies within community plans guide development in a manner that maintains the existing balance of land uses, preserves the character of the community, and complements existing development. The following are the proposed community plans within the unincorporated areas of the County.

Action taken by the Planning Commission on this item may be appealed to the Board.
Note: Recommendations to the Board of Supervisors are not appealable.

Yes ☐ No ☒

- Bear Valley
- Bloomington
- Crest Forest
- Hilltop
- Homestead Valley
- Joshua Tree
- Lake Arrowhead
- Lucerne Valley
- Lytle Creek
- Morongo Valley
- Muscoy
- Oak Glen
- Phelan/Pinon Hills

Each of the community plans within a given geographical region is structured with the same general format, and has many common policies. The policies common to several community plans within a region formed the basis for preparing the regional goals and policies. The regional policies also apply to areas outside of specified community plan areas. The format of the community plans mirrors the overall format of the General Plan to provide consistency between each of the documents.

Because the Oak Hills Community Plan was recently adopted by the Board of Supervisors, it will merely be reformatted to be consistent with the other 13 community plans.

The October 5th hearing will focus on the two Valley Region Community Plans and the "hotspot analyses" and other proposed land use zoning district changes that are included in the General Plan Update Program.

Valley Region Community Plans

Two communities plans have been prepared within the Valley Region. A brief description of the unique issues for each community plan is presented below:

Bloomington Community Plan - Key concerns in this community are preserving examples of a rural lifestyle by maintaining areas of low-density residential development, generally south of the I-10 Freeway, while also accommodating higher density, more urban housing opportunities, increasing commercial development to meet the needs of a diverse and growing population; maintaining an equestrian-friendly environment with small agriculture and animal-raising opportunities; providing a network of public and private open space, trail corridors and facilities for active and passive recreation; and ensuring adequate infrastructure commensurate with meeting the community needs.

The new Community Plan acknowledges two distinct portions of the community that have a different character. North Bloomington represents that area north of the freeway that has more conventional urban style residential tracts and also contains most of the commercial businesses. This area has experienced considerable annexations over the years and is more urbanized. South Bloomington includes less developed areas that contain the Bloomington school sites, locations where large lots and vacant land can still be found, and limited commercial development along Cedar Avenue. This community plan maintains the current land use zoning district patterns, except for some limited changes along the border with the City of Fontana. However, to better reflect the community interests while at the same time considering past and anticipated future trends in residential development in South Bloomington, four policy areas have been created. Policy BL/LU 2.2 in the Land Use Element section defines four policy subareas south of Slover Ave. with the following specific

requirements: Subarea A - one acre minimum parcel size with the AA Overlay; and Subareas B, C and D - 20,000 sq. ft. minimum parcel size with the AA Overlay (see Attachment 3). The policy areas retain the historic one-half acre lot size zoning where sewers are non-existent and on-site septic disposal can continue to be used. These areas act as a transition to the lowest density designations of one-acre lot size residential zoning that are vestiges of the original community plan of the 80's. The low-density areas are located at the southern most portion of the community that abut the Jurupa Hills along the Riverside-San Bernardino County line. In contrast with the half acre and one acre policy areas, other pockets of vacant or underdeveloped land contiguous and, in many cases, nearly surrounded by higher density conventional residential tracts, are linked together with a Single Residential 7200 square foot minimum lot size (RS) designation. The half acre and one acre zoning retains the AA (Additional Agriculture) Overlay that allows slightly more animals per lot area. The only actual zoning changes that were in the plan area were those associated with the "hotspot" analysis conducted for the areas within the sphere of influence for the City of Fontana.

Muscoy Community Plan Key concerns include a desire to retain the rural character of the community by maintaining primarily low-density residential development west of State Street; providing agricultural and animal raising opportunities and an equestrian-friendly environment; and providing opportunities for commercial development that serves the needs of local residents. Future pressures for more urbanized type development was recognized as an inevitable consequence of the easterly extension of the 210 Freeway and an interchange at State Street that will provide north-south circulation linkage to the 215 and the State University area.

The Muscoy Community Plan contains several zoning updates that matches lower residential densities west of State Street with the lack of sewerage that mandates minimum two dwelling units per acre density standards of the Water Quality Control Board. This area also retains its AA Overlay. Also, considerable changes were made along State Street to increase commercial zoning in recognition of the traffic and associated customer base that will be created by the 210 Interchange. Higher density development is anticipated east of State Street due to the area's proximity to public water and sewer service. Planned residential development can be accomplished through the Special Development zoning district contiguous to the expanded commercial designations along State Street.

Hotspot Analyses and Other Proposed Land Use Zoning District Changes

The proposed Land Use Zoning District Changes are categorized as follows:

General Changes

- Removed all obsolete zoning "prefixes" and "suffixes";
- Revised all residential land use designations into a standardized list of minimum lot sizes for the Agriculture, Rural Living, and Single Family Residential designations;
 - RS
 - RS-10M
 - RS14M
 - RS-20M
 - RS-1
 - RM
 - RL
 - RL-5
 - RL-10
 - RL-20
 - RL-40
 - AG
 - AG-20
 - AG-40
 - AG-80
 - AG-160

- Changed all Planned Development (PD) designations to Specific Development (SD) with either a residential or commercial suffix

Community Plans

- Hilltop: Change 20 parcels on the east end and on both sides of Green Valley Lake Rd. from HT/CG-SCp (Hilltop/General Commercial-Sign Control Overlay) to HT/RS (Hilltop/Single Residential) and four parcels from HT/CG-SCp (Hilltop/General Commercial-Sign Control Overlay) to HT/CN (Hilltop/Neighborhood Commercial)
- Homestead Valley: Change numerous parcels northeast of the intersection of Becker Rd. and Napa Rd. from RL-5 (Rural Living-five acre minimum parcel size) to HV/RL (Homestead Valley/Rural Living)
- Lake Arrowhead: Change 10 parcels on the west end of Rimforest and on the north side of Highway 18 from LA/CO (Lake Arrowhead/Office Commercial) to LA/CS (Lake Arrowhead/Service Commercial) to conform to the historic uses of these parcels; change one parcel on the north side of Highway 189 just east of Rose Ln. on which an institutional use has been converted to a commercial use from LA/RS-14M (Lake Arrowhead/Single Residential-14,000 sq. ft. minimum parcel size) to LA/CN (Lake Arrowhead/Neighborhood Commercial)
- Lucerne Valley: Change 12 parcels southwest of the intersection of Wren and Christenson Roads from RL (Rural Living) to LV/IC (Lucerne Valley/Community Industrial); change one parcel on the southwest corner of Via Seco and Kendall Roads from RL (Rural Living) to LV/CR (Lucerne Valley/Rural Commercial); change 12 parcels southeast of the intersection of Via Seco and Kendall Roads from RL (Rural Living) to LV/RS (Lucerne Valley/Single Residential); and change four parcels southeast of Crystal Creek and Furnace Creek Roads from RL (Rural Living) to LV/IC (Lucerne Valley/Community Industrial)
- Muscoy: Multiple changes as a result of the public meetings on the community plan
- Phelan: Change parcels on the north side of Highway 138 from PH/CO (Phelan/Office Commercial) to PH/CG CO (Phelan/General Commercial) in Piñon Hills; change 21 parcels on both sides of Phelan Rd. from Paramount Rd. east to include the parcels on the east side of Eaby Rd. from PH/RS-1 (Phelan/Single Residential-one acre minimum parcel size) to PH/SD (Phelan/Special Development); change 27 parcels on both sides of Phelan Rd. from Lebec Rd. west to include the parcels on the west side of Beekley Rd. from PH/RS-1 (Phelan/Single Residential-one acre minimum parcel size) to PH/SD (Phelan/Special Development); move the northern boundary of the Phelan/Piñon Hills Community Plan south to Palmdale Rd. (Highway 18).

"Hotspot" Analyses

During the development of the General Plan Update approach, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to conduct a detailed zoning analysis for two "hotspot" areas. Both areas lie within the spheres of influence of adjoining cities, West Fontana within the sphere of the City of Fontana and Mentone within the sphere of the City of Redlands. These areas have never had focused zoning level review to address compatibility and appropriate land uses. These areas have become a hodgepodge of land uses, many of which are illegal. Many of these land uses are also non-conforming in that they are not allowed in the current land use zoning district in which they are located. Thus, there was interest in aligning the County's zoning with the pre-zoning designations assigned by the cities to the extent practical. As a result, staff has met with the planning staffs of both cities, coordinating the county's land use pattern with the cities, recognizing the existing subdivision patterns and bringing consistency between the jurisdictions. These changes to the land use zoning

district designations will not legalize any use that was established without obtaining the proper land use approvals.

Sphere Areas

- Apple Valley: Change four parcels on the southeast and southwest corners of Rock Springs and Deep Creek Roads from AG-SCp (Agriculture-Sign Control Overlay) to CN (Neighborhood Commercial)
- Chino: Multiple changes to conform to the City of Chino's pre-zoning for the area
- Hesperia (Oak Hills): Change 49 parcels in the northeast area of Oak Hills to conform to the City of Hesperia's pre-zoning for the area and to recognize the existing subdivision patterns; change three parcels southeast corner of Ranchero Rd. and Coriander Dr. from OH/RL (Oak Hills/Rural Living) to OH/CN (Oak Hills/Neighborhood Commercial); align the OH/CN (Oak Hills/Neighborhood Commercial) Land Use Zoning District at the intersection of Ranchero Rd. and Escondido Ave. to the parcels in the area
- Montclair: Multiple changes to conform to the City of Montclair's pre-zoning for the area

Miscellaneous

- I-40: Hector Rd. intersection from RC to CH; Crucero Rd. intersection at Ludlow from CR to CH
- Open Space designations in the unincorporated area north of the City of Rancho Cucamonga and in the Morongo Valley Community Plan area

Recommendation

CONTINUE the hearing on the General Plan Update to October 19, 2006, to consider the Development Code Update.

Attachments

1. Draft Bloomington Community Plan (Available electronically at www.sbcounty.gov/landuseservices)
2. Draft Muscoy Community Plan (Available electronically at www.sbcounty.gov/landuseservices)
3. [Bloomington Policy Areas](#)
4. [Proposed Map Changes](#)
5. [Proposed Changes to the Phelan/Piñon Hills Community Plan](#)
6. [Responses to Oral and Written Comments Received at the September 21, 2006 Planning Commission Hearing](#)